

REMARKS

Claims 24 and 26-42 are pending in the instant application. Claims 24, 31, 34, and 40 are independent claims. All of the pending claims stand rejected in the pending office action. The rejections of the pending claims are hereby traversed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 24 and 26-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,373,140, issued to Matsumoto (Matsumoto) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,533,174, issued to Flowers, et al. (Flowers). Claim 24 recites, in part, that a server “receiv[es] text data addressed to a designated one of the devices, the text data comprising text and font identifiers, the font identifiers identifying which fonts to use to render the text.” Claim 24 further recites that the server “transfer[s] the lacking font structure data and the text data to the designated device.” In rejecting claim 24, the office action asserts that Flowers “describes receiving text data addressed to a device which include text and font identifiers.” (Office Action, p. 3.) As support for this assertion, the office action cites the passage at column 5, lines 5-15 of Flowers. The office action goes on to state that “[t]he FAF server transfers the lacking font structure data and the text data to the device.” (Office Action, p. 3.) The office action cites to column 3, lines 25-45 as support for this statement. The cited passages read as follows:

When a client is instructed to display or print a particular data file, it determines if the user has selected a font which exists in font storage 18. If user has, the client sends to the font server 16 a make font request which identifies the selected font by name (step 42). The request also includes a “font object” identifier, which is a shortened name that the client and the server can then use to refer to the font selected for this application. The make font request may further include various customizing requirements, such as orientation, language-specific characters, and so forth as discussed below with reference to FIG. 4. (Flowers, col. 5, lines 5-15.)

The user may also specify features such as glyph mapping or other character transformation instructions, for customizing the font to produce

a desired print or display and request that the FAF font server retrieve an appropriate font from storage and prepare the font for use with the current application.

To minimize traffic on the network, the FAF font server and clients communicate using name-identifiers, that is, abbreviations of "structured names," which are used for characters, lists of characters or other font-related information which is repeatedly communicated back and forth over the network. Structured names are discussed below in a section of the application entitled Features.

The FAF font server and the client each maintain a name-identifier table associating, as directed by the client, the name-identifiers with the various structured names. The client sends update information to the FAF server, so that the table is current. If the client must use a different FAF font server, the client sends to this server a copy of the name-identifier table and then uses the name identifiers in further communications with the server. (Flowers, col. 3, lines 25-45.)

Nothing in the cited passages, or any other portion of Flowers, describes that a server receives text data addressed to a designated one of the devices, the text data comprising text and font identifiers, and that the server transfers the lacking font structure data and the text data to the designated device. The office action equates the FAF server with the server recited in claim 24 that transfers lacking font structure data and text data to the designated device. The FAF server, however, is solely a font server, which is used only to transfer font information to a requestor. The FAF server does not receive or transfer text data addressed to a device, as recited in claim 24. As the passage from column 5 of Flowers shows, the client (i.e., a printer) is instructed to display or print a file. If necessary, the client makes a "font request" that is transmitted to the FAF server. If the client makes such a font request, then it must already (1) have received the text data it is to print, and (2) be lacking font data needed to print the text data. Thus, neither the client nor the FAF server described in Flowers may fulfill the functions of the server recited in claim 24. For at least these reasons, the cited references fail to disclose the subject matter of the claim. Thus, claim 24 is allowable and should proceed to issuance.

The applicant disagrees with other positions in the office action as well. For example, claim 28 recites “determining whether another font identifier exists that is the same as the font identifier for which font structure data is lacking.” In rejecting this claim, the office action cites the passage at column 6, lines 1-5 of Flowers, which reads:

The font server 16 responds to each request by sending to the client only the requested information, and thus, keeps traffic on the network to a minimum. This also allows the client to allocate the use of its storage facilities, making available only the space required to store the requested information.

The office action states that this passage from Flowers discloses “determining whether any of the font identifiers in the received text data that are not found in the font capabilities list of the designated device have equivalent counterparts that are found in the font capabilities list of the designated device.” (Office Action, p. 4.) Nothing in the cited passage discloses determining whether there are equivalent counterparts in the font capabilities list, as asserted in the office action. The cited passage describes only that the font server sends “only the requested information,” which “keeps traffic on the network to a minimum.” The requested information is the lacking font information. Sending only that information to the requestor in no way discloses determining whether an existing font identifier is the same as a font identifier for which font structure data is lacking, as recited in the claim. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 28 is patentable over the cited references and should proceed to issuance.

Independent claims 31, 34, and 40 recite subject matter analogous to that recited in claim 24. Further, the office action cites the same portions of Matsumoto and Flowers in the rejections of claims 31, 34, and 40 as are cited in the rejection of claim 24. Thus, claims 31, 34, and 40 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 24. It is also noted that the applicant has not provided arguments with respect to certain of the dependent claims in the instant application. This is done without prejudice to the applicant’s right to present such


arguments at any point in the future. In addition, because each of the dependent claims depends from an independent claim that is itself allowable, the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as are the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, the pending claims are allowable. The examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY



Joseph M. Sauer (Reg. No. 47,919)
Jones Day
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7506